

Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group Meeting Notes – 20th September 2018

Date & time:	20 th September 2018: 14.00-17.00 Holiday Inn London Regents Park, Carburton Street, London, W1W 5EE
Chair:	Helen J Wass
	Presentations attached

Item	Topic	Lead
1	Welcome and introductions	Chair
2	<p>Community engagement</p> <p>HB: senior community engagement manager outlined the three HS2 Heritage Open Days held at Old Curzon Street Station Birmingham, St Mary's old church Stoke Mandeville and Euston.</p> <p>AW asked if people expressing views on the project generally or were purely interested in heritage.</p> <p>HS2 replied that there was an element of that, but mostly people were there out of archaeological interest.</p> <p>NM noted that HE had been invited to have a presence and wanted to help but their email was never responded too.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to investigate the miscommunication.</p> <p>Media Communications</p> <p>ME: senior communication manager showed the draft animation and the rushes from the TV series.</p> <p>ME outlined the forthcoming archaeology campaign that will be across all media platforms. This was the start of an ongoing campaign as works progress.</p>	

3	<p>Archives consultation</p> <p>HJW outlined the forthcoming consultation on HS2's archive strategy.</p> <p>LAM: how much money would HS2 pay per box and if there would be funding for extra deposition above what we normally have?</p> <p>HJW replied that the consultation will cover this issue and that attendees will need to come prepared. HS2 will send out documentation prior to the meeting.</p> <p>JW noted that the workshop would consider the logistics and the legacy opportunities.</p> <p>CW queries the local, regional and national options – does HS2 actually want one or the other rather than risk a hybrid solution?</p> <p>HJW replied that this would be a key part of the consultation.</p> <p>SB asked about the timescale for the consultation.</p> <p>HJW replied that 'collateral' for the event is being developed during October and that the consultation event would be sometime in November, in Birmingham.</p>	
4	<p>Historic Environment Records</p> <p>SB summarised the requests that have gone to all line of route HERs in order to understand how long it takes HER officers to accession information.</p> <p>SB confirmed that about 50% of SLAs have replied and have answered in different ways.</p> <p>HJW clarified that this request is been undertaken with a view to finding out how much it will cost and whether there will money available from HS2 under the SLAs.</p> <p>SB will also ask HERs if they want all the available data or a subset of spatial data.</p> <p>AS asked when HS2/its contractors will be sending information to the HER and at what stage it would be appropriate for HERs to enter information as an event?</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to prepare a note providing guidance on the process.</p>	

5	<p>HERDS update</p> <p>JH outlined the proposed workshop(s) for mitigation criteria and decision-making that will include curators, HE, Contractors and HS2.</p> <p>JH discussed its work to review areas of negative evidence (not blank areas) and recent discussions with the EngLaid project.</p> <p>AS highlighted the need for supporting information to make decisions and raised the need for Contractors to justify the approach to evaluation in their project plans.</p> <p>JH noted that route-wide questions are part of the HERDS and that new information coming in influenced the works.</p> <p>AS expressed concern about 2% sampling for trial trenching as has been proposed in some project plans; not convinced of the use of that given her experience and effectiveness of geophysics in as an initial assessment method.</p> <p>JH considered that a 2% + contingency is a sensible approach and stressed the need for each location to be reviewed on its merits, with varying percentages being undertaken. Trial trenching is not just based on the results of geophysical survey, but a range of techniques.</p> <p>AS stated that they has not seen supporting information for that approach.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to investigate with its Supply Chain to ensure that Officers have sufficient information and time to provide informed comment; that engagement was meaningful.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Sharepoint folder of Code 1 documentation is being updated.</p> <p>CW noted that areas were not really 'blank'. One technique to consider was topsoil sampling.</p> <p>LAM noted that Saxons evidence can occur unexpectedly when only Roman remains were anticipated – so what was being missed in evaluation trenching?</p> <p>PM requested regular updates about recent and programmed works.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to consider issuing/requiring weekly emails from the Contractors.</p>	
---	---	--

6	<p>AOB</p> <p>Fox and Grapes</p> <p>NM and CP noted the recent Fox and Grapes issues. They praised the Head of Environment and Area North historic environment team for their efforts to achieve a resolution.</p> <p>HJW thanked NM and CP for their considerable input.</p> <p>NM and CP requested that an investigation be undertaken into all the surrounding events.</p> <p>HJW assured them that lessons would be learned.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to feedback lessons learned</p> <p>Communications and Knowledge</p> <p>CW raised issues regarding the MWCC not as up to date with archaeological/heritage issues and requirements as expected.</p> <p>This was echoed by CM and experiences with the MWCC regarding the number of contacts on any given location, mixed messages and apparently uncoordinated.</p> <p>HJW reiterated the importance of the HS2 Area Historic Environment Manager roles as first points of contact or unsure of who and how to make contact, or if unhappy with contractor engagement.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to send out reminder of historic environment contact details</p> <p>Schedule 17</p> <p>SB highlighted that they were in pre-application on three Schedule 17s for ecological mitigation and noted that the EWC discussions didn't appear to be including archaeologists.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to set up meeting with SB/LM/HS2 to understand the issues raised, e.g. LM provided information for wrong sites. As per previous point from AS regarding the provision of sufficient information to archaeological officers.</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>HERDS digital platform</p> <p>SB asked when the digital platform would be available as this would be a good tool to see where work had been done/was planned.</p> <p>JH informed the sub-group that the platform was undergoing testing and then would inform members when it was live.</p> <p>Project Plan Review</p> <p>WCC didn't consider that the review process for project plans was working properly.</p> <p>ACTION: See reply to action in item 5.</p> <p>December Meeting</p> <p>The next Heritage Sub-group meeting will be in December in Birmingham.</p> <p>Date and venue TBC</p>	
--	---	--

Attendees

Organisation	Initials
Camden Council	AW
Chiltern District Council	CM
Staffordshire County Council	SK & SB
Northamptonshire County Council	LAM
Warwickshire County Council	AS
Buckinghamshire County Council	PM
Birmingham City Council	CP
Hertfordshire County Council	AT
Historic England	CW, JW, NM, AC
HS2	AB, TH, JM, CJ, JH, MC, NS, EH, HB*, ME* * presentation only